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Abstract

Minutes for the IEEE 802.11 REVmc BRC Telecons

R0 = July 8th telecom minutes

R1 = July 15th Telecom minutes added

1. REVmc BRC Telecon July 8th 2016
   1. **Called to order** at 10:04am ET by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Patent Policy** Reviewed
      1. No issues noted
   3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HPE), Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Emily QI (Intel); Hasan YAGHOOBI (Intel); Kazayuki SAKODA (Sony); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Osama ABOUL-MAGD (Huawei); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna); Thomas HANDTE (Sony); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus) Jinjing JIANG (Marvell); Mark RISON (Samsung); Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm);
   4. **Review Agenda**
      1. Approved agenda:
         1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy
         2. Editor report 11-13-95r31
         3. Comment resolution:
            1. 11-16-820 Adrian STEPHENS,
            2. 11-16-824 Graham SMITH,
            3. 11-16-823 Kazayuki SAKODA
         4. July EC Report and Revcom approval plan
         5. AOB – additional teleconferences
         6. Adjourn
   5. **Editor Report** – 11-13/95r31 – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-31-000m-editor-reports.pptx>
      2. Review updated presentation
      3. 334 New Comments for 2nd Recirculation
      4. 62 comments have Resolution drafted – 3 need extra review
      5. Expected 43 days if we resolve on the same rate as before.
         1. Resolve SB2, 15-day Recirc (SB3-D7), then 10 day Recirc (SB4 – D7)
         2. Only 26 days to make the Aug 5th deadline.
   6. **Review Doc 11-16/820r1** Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-00-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>
      2. CID 8074 (GEN)
         1. Review comment
         2. Review proposed change – P203.53
         3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 8085 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review Proposed change – P3163.50 and P3164.6
         3. ACTION ITEM #1: KAZ to research the need for two variables
         4. Will review next week.
      4. CID 8090 (GEN)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      5. CID 8186 (GEN) --- (Note CID change later in call)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Inconsistency noted in cases cited.
         3. Special value 255 indicates multiple antennas
         4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; Change 256 to 254 at 2215.4, 2215.26 and 2254.64; Change 255 to 254 at 3239.60 and 3248.60

These changes make the changes requested by Commenter.

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8187 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review location at P2254.61
       3. Review Page 2270.60 which uses 0-255
       4. Proposed Resolution: Revised; At 2254.61 change 256 to 254.

In reply to the commenter, the comment provides no justification for allowing the use of “0” as a lower bound, neither does explain that this would mean in this context.

* + - 1. Discussion on the changes could allow more comments in the next round, and as these two CIDs are really out of scope.
      2. Change the Proposed resolution for this CID and for CID 8186
      3. Proposed Resolution for CID 8187(GEN) and CID 8186(GEN): Rejected. The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
      4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8057 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Case 3 is covered on the subsequent section on the cited page.
       4. Discussion on where to put this new sentence.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-08 14:52:12Z):. At 1585.24 after “or lifetime limit.” insert the following new sentence: “If the AP does not receive a Block Ack frame in response to an A-MPDU that contains one or more individually addressed Data frames that require acknowledgment containing all or part of an MSDU or A-MSDU sent with the EOSP subfield equal to 1 it shall retransmit at least one of those frames at least once within the same SP, subject to applicable retry or lifetime limit.”
       6. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 8078 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Discussion on the “order”
       3. Possible to have this CID rejected due to scope.
       4. After more discussion, determined group willing to accept the proposed resolution.
       5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-08 14:58:49Z): At 562.35 replace “Each figure in Clause 9 (Frame formats) depicts the fields/subfields as they appear in the MAC frame and in the order in which they are passed to the physical layer (PHY), from left to right.” with: “Each figure and table in Clause 9 (Frame formats) … from left to right and then from top to bottom”
       6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 8128 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Discussion on the specific changes.
       3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-08 15:02:05Z):. At 562.35: replace “fields” with “components (e.g., fields, subfields, elements and subelements)”

At 562.36: replace “the fields/subfields” with “the components”

* + - 1. No objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8133 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. **Straw Poll** – in favor in of changing prior sentence also – 4 yes
       3. No further count was made as the objection was withdrawn.
    2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-08 15:04:46Z): Make changes as shown in 11-16/820r1 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-01-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>), for CID 8133. These effect the intent of the comment and improve the previous sentence for consistency.
       1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 8140 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Discussion on why the proposed change is correct.
       4. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-08 15:14:35Z)
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    4. CID 8199 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review Discussion
       3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-08 15:18:27Z): The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 8059 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Should be moved the CID to “Security” and assign to Jouni MALINEN
    6. CID 8082 (GEN)
       1. Assign to Carlos CORDEIRO
    7. CID 8137 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Previous discussion ARC reviewed.
          1. Scoreboarding was assigned similar to a simple Block ACK and so any frame would be ACK
       4. Discussion on the location of where the duplicate detection would need to appear relative to the Scoreboarding.
       5. Moving where the Scoreboarding is located discussed.
       6. Forging a frame at the Scoreboarding is no different than a forged frame at the simple ACK.
       7. Discussion on how a possible attack would be different than a sequence number attack.
       8. Ran out of time, so we will not resolve at this time.
          1. Proposed Resolution: Revised.

1. Remove the brace graphic and adjacent text “The ‘MPDU Decryption and Integrity (optional)’ and ‘Block Ack Buffering and Reordering’ processes may be performed in either order (RX)”
2. Move the “MPDU Encryption (TX) / Decryption (RX) and Integrity (optional)” block to be below the row that includes “Block Ack Scoreboarding”
3. Add “\*\*” after the text in the following boxes
   1. Block Ack Buffering and Reordering
   2. Duplicate Detection
   3. Block Ack Scoreboarding
   4. MPDU Encryption …

4. Add a note in the region to the right containing: “\*\* These processes might be performed in an implementation in any relative order, with different implications for performance and possible vulnerability to certain denial of service attacks.”

* + - 1. More discussion will need to be done.
    1. Note Security Related CIDs will be assigned to Jouni
    2. Question on if there was a new ARC conference call soon – answer no, but we could set up another BRC call on this topic if needed. Remember to use the reflector for more discussion.
  1. **Review document – 11-16/824r1** – Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0824-00-000m-resolution-for-cids-8083-8251-8127-8269-8270.docx>
     2. CID 8083 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accept
        3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 8251 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on use of May/Might.
        3. Proposed Resolution: CID 8251 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-08 15:34:53Z): At 1377.62 and 1377.63 change "may" to "might". At 1310.58 change "may" to "might"
        4. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 8127 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. There was an issue with the comment import, the correct comment “"Gaps might exist in the ordering of fields and elements within frames. The order that remains is ascending." is not very clear (the order of what?) but assuming it is referring to the order of elements by element ID, the second statement is wrong (e.g. Quiet and TPC Report in beacons, VSIEs in all frames that can take an element with ID > 221, MME/AMPE, etc.)”
        3. Discussion on “Order”
           1. The cited sentence is correct, but not adhered to in practice
        4. Compliant STA would adhere to the standard
        5. Propose to just reject the CID
        6. The interoperability should be foremost in the consideration.
        7. Discussion on the possible resolution options
        8. Straw Poll:
           1. Accept - 111
           2. Reject – out of Scope - 111
           3. Abstain – 11111
           4. Result – 3-3-5
        9. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-08 15:53:41Z): The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        10. Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 8269 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. The comment had been cut off as well. The full comment:

"The Estimated Air Time Fraction subfield is 8 bits in length and contains an unsigned integer that represents the predicted percentage of time, linearly scaled with 255 representing 100%, that a new STA joining the BSS will be allocated for PPDUs carrying Data of the corresponding AC for that STA." -- if you look at R.7 it turns out that this is exactly the time for the PPDUs, not including any contention/IFS time. This is a very subtle point (and differs from e.g. admission control).

* + - 1. Review Discussion
      2. Discussion of the precision of the calculations and if the note is warranted.
      3. Discussion on why the rejection is warranted
         1. Alternative rejections reasons discussed
         2. Out of scope – no change where in this area
         3. Text is clear and this is just a note – no need
         4. Calculation is not that precise and the note implies something that is not
      4. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-08 16:07:08Z): The proposed note is not viewed as necessary, as the cited text is clear.
      5. Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 8270 (MAC) and 8266 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review discussion
       3. Proposed Change cites “other comment”, but not clear which it is.
          1. From Commenter: """The Data PPDU Duration Target field is 8 bits in length and is an unsigned integer that indicates theexpected target duration of PPDUs that contain at least one MPDU with the Type subfield equal to Data"" -- but the equations in R.7 assume the PPDU contains just Data MPDUs"
       4. Discussion on what the update revised “Proposed Resolution:”
          1. Change "at least one MPDU" to "only MPDUs" in the cited text
       5. Similar to CID 8266 (MAC) and the changes being suggested by the Editors in CID 8273 (Editor)
       6. Suggestion that input from Matthew FISCHER, but we could choose the best guess and check with him afterward.
       7. Proposed Resolution for CID 8270 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-08 16:12:02Z): Change the cited text to "PPDUs that contain only MPDUs with the Type subfield equal to Data"
       8. Proposed Resolution for CID 8266 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2016-07-08 16:12:02Z)
       9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review document 11-16/823r0** – Kazuyuki SAKODA (Sony)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0823-00-000m-cid8028-high-throughput-airtime-link-metric.docx>
     2. CID 8028 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Explanation on the scale needed for accurate metric values.
        4. Discussion on how this change affects aggregation
        5. Concern with some grammar,
        6. Objection to the change at this time. Better to take up next revision.
        7. Discussion on the Goal of getting the REVmc done by Aug 5th Submission deadline.
        8. **Straw Poll:**
           1. Accept the possible proposed change direction
           2. Reject Comment as Out of Scope
           3. Results: 1-6-2 – clear direction for rejection
        9. Suggestion that the submission be updated and resubmit for consideration for REVmd
        10. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-08 16:43:40Z): The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment
        11. Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Return to doc 11-16/820r1**
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-00-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>
     2. CID 8222 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review Discussion
        3. Discussion on the value of Estimated Throughput in both or only in outbound direction.
        4. Need to include a change at 3623.50 also
        5. Discussion on the value of the change
        6. Discussion on how to possibly reject the Comment
           1. not really an “Out of Scope”
           2. The R.1 equation uses EstimatedThroughput and not “inbound/outbound” so implies both are equal.
        7. The R7 equation is for both inbound and outbound as they are calculated separately.
        8. Ran out of Time
     3. Will take up later
  3. Next call is July 15th at the normal time -- 3 hour call – 10am-1pm ET
  4. Proposal for new calls
     1. July 19th and July 22nd proposed
        1. No support for July 22nd
        2. Change to July 21st for two hours – 10am-noon ET
        3. July 19th 10am ET for two hours – 10am-noon ET
  5. Request to do some more assignments before the next telecom
     1. The TG leadership to have an adhoc call to suggest assignments prior to next telecom.
  6. Adjourned at 1:02pm ET

1. REVmc BRC Telecon July 15th 2016
   1. **Called to order** at 10:04am ET by the chair, Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
   2. **Patent Policy** Reviewed
      1. No issues noted
   3. **Attendance**: Dorothy STANLEY (HPE), Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm), Adrian STEPHENS (Intel); Edward AU (Huawei); Hasan YAGHOOBI (Intel); Jinjing JIANG (Marvell);

Emily QI (Intel); Graham SMITH (SR Technologies); Kazayuki SAKODA (Sony);

Yusuke Tanaka (Sony); Amal Ekbal (National Instruments); Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus) Mark RISON (Samsung); Menzo WENTINK (Qualcomm); Payam Torab (Broadcom); Sigurd SCHELSTRAETE (Quantenna); Sean Coffey (Realtek); Thomas HANDTE (Sony); Dick ROY (SRA); Lei WANG (Marvell)

* 1. **Review Agenda**
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0833-02-000m-tgmc-brc-july-2016-teleconference-agenda-document.docx>
     2. The approved agenda is:

1. Call to order, attendance, and patent policy

2. Editor report – any issues with editing of approved CIDs

3. Comment resolution –

1. 11-16-826 – Edward AU (Huawei)
2. 11-16-820 – Adrian STEPHENS (Intel), continue with CID 8137 (1 hour)
3. 11-16-831 & 11-16/842 – Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)

CID 8055, 8170 (20 Mins)

1. 11-16-665R37 “Review” comment group – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm) (30 Mins)
2. 11-16-834 – Stephen McCann – ANQP CIDs
3. 11-16-840, 841 – Thomas (20 mins)
4. 11-16-822 Hassan/Ganesh (20 mins)

4. Motions – at 12:45 Eastern

5. AOB:

Schedule

1. Expect to miss the August 5th Revcom submission date (leading to Sept 2016 RevCom approval)
2. Thus, the TGmc plan changes to October 17th Revcom Submission date (leading to Dec 2016 RevCom approval)
3. July 28 or ideally earlier: Comment resolution on this SB complete
4. July 30 – Aug 15 editing and review of editing
5. Aug 15 – Aug 30: SB recirculation
6. On or before Sept 9: Complete comment resolution (goal unchanged draft)
7. Sept 10 to Sept 20: 10 day recirculation of unchanged draft
8. Sept 10: TGai and TGah can begin to make any changes required based on TGmc changes (in September meeting)
9. October 4th: EC teleconference approval – requests for unconditional approval for TGmc, TGah, TGai

6. Adjourn

* + 1. R2 of the draft agenda was presented
    2. Add doc 11-16/842 from Graham
    3. Edward asked to be moved first to allow for an absence he is expecting during the call
    4. Agenda Approved by unanimous consent.
  1. **Editor Report – 11-13/95r32 –** Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/13/11-13-0095-32-000m-editor-reports.pptx>
     2. New Comment groups “Out of Scope” and “Insufficient Detail”
     3. Review slides 1-11
     4. Slide 9 – End timing
        1. TGai and TGah have been forced to slip by 3 months due to the REVmc delay.
        2. Review embed Project plan
     5. Will create an extra review panel for change review
  2. **Review doc: 11-16/826r0 –** Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0826-00-000m-resolution-for-some-sb2-comments.docx>
     2. CID 8091 (GEN)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-15 14:19:23Z); *.*The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        4. Discussion on the need to make a similar change, but do so in REVmd.
        5. No objection – Mark ready for Motion
     3. CID 8072 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion and the options for resolution
        3. Proposed Resolutions: There are two way forward options for the group to decide:

Option 1:

* Reject the resolution with the following reason: “the comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.”

Option 2:

* Revised with the following changes:
* At line 159.42, replace “The capabilities to be advertised for the BSS.” with “The STA capabilities to be advertised.”
* At line 159.46, replace “The capabilities to be advertised for the BSS.” with “Specifies the parameters in the HT Capabilities element that are supported by the STA.”
  + - 1. Discussion on how to move forward.
      2. For now, a resolution will be prepared for Option 1 and ready for motion.
      3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-15 14:25:31Z) the comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment
      4. No objection – Mark ready for motion
    1. CID 8073 (GEN)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-15 14:27:35Z) the comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment
       3. No objection – Mark Ready for motion
    2. CID 8002 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-15 14:28:18Z)
       3. Discussion on if this is related to a change or other unsatisfied MSB CID.
       4. Discussion on accepting this change
       5. No objection – Mark Ready for motion
  1. Review doc 11-16/820r3 Adrian STEPHENS (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0820-03-000m-sb2-stephens-resolutions.doc>
     2. CID 8137 (GEN)
        1. Review comment and action items
        2. ACTION ITEM #2 : Mark Hamilton to bring Rejection text – Assign CID to Mark HAMILTON
     3. CID 8222 (GEN)
        1. Review status
        2. Previous action item was to have Matthew FISCHER to provide some feedback
        3. More time to allow Matthew time to respond was requested.
     4. CID 8256 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-15 14:42:39Z)
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for motion
     5. CID 8314 (GEN)
        1. Move to Security Comment group
        2. Assigned to Jouni MALINEN, insufficient detail default resolution
        3. Adrian to delete from his submission
     6. CID 8008 (MAC)
        1. Assign to Carlos CORDEIRO.
        2. Adrian to delete from his submission.
     7. CID 8069 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion debated and the proposed resolution objected to.
        3. Proposed resolution updated: Proposed resolution:Revised. At cited location, After “All IBSS STAs”, add “, except the DFS owner”
        4. ACTION ITEM #3: add permission for DFS owner to change the schedule. And update proposal
     8. CID 8070 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Discussion on if this was or was not out of scope…
        3. Proposed resolution was to reject out of scope, but it was determined to have a new proposal made.
        4. ACTION ITEM #4: Assign Kaz, Mark R and Adrian to work together to proposal alternate resolution.
     9. CID 8141 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Discussion on the difference of MSDU and frames
        4. Possible rejection could be for out of scope.
        5. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Change: at 1268.02: “1268.02: “Group addressed MSDUs or MMPDUs shall not be fragmented even if their length exceeds dot11FragmentationThreshold.” to: “1268.02: “MSDUs or MMPDUs carried in a group addressed MPDU shall not be fragmented even if their length exceeds dot11FragmentationThreshold.”

At 1309.32: Change “The MAC may fragment and reassemble individually addressed MSDUs or MMPDUs.” to “The MAC may fragment and reassemble MSDUs or MMPDUs that are carried in individually addressed MPDUs.”

* + - 1. **Straw Poll:** Should the change be made as proposed by Adrian
         1. Yes: No: Abstain:
         2. Results: 6-4-5
      2. Mark Hamilton noted that the resolution has some minor errors, and will have a correct version posted:
      3. *Corrected Resolution:* REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-15 14:53:21Z):

Change: at 1268.02: "Group addressed MSDUs or MMPDUs shall not be fragmented even if their length exceeds dot11FragmentationThreshold."

to:

"MSDUs or MMPDUs carried in a group addressed MPDU shall not be fragmented even if their length exceeds dot11FragmentationThreshold."

At 1309.32: Change "The MAC may fragment and reassemble individually addressed MSDUs or MMPDUs."

to

"The MAC may fragment and reassemble MSDUs or MMPDUs that are carried in individually addressed MPDUs."

* + - 1. Mark Resolution ready for motion
    1. CID 8313 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed resolution: REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-15 17:16:29Z): The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
       3. No discussion – No Objection – Mark Ready for motion
    2. CID 8328 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Need to have more discussion
       3. Assign to Payam for review – he made the comment, so he obviously likes the proposed change.
       4. The proposal is to remove a previous change
       5. We need to identify the source of the objected text and work out the issue.
       6. ACTION ITEM #5: Propose time on Next Thursday Telecon to discuss
    3. CID 8336 (MAC)
       1. Review comment
       2. Review context
       3. Discussion on the need to have a different method to define the variable.
       4. Differing opinons on the change or not.
       5. Proposed resolution REJECTED (MAC: 2016-07-15 15:06:34Z): The text at 1278.35 states: "and StartDelayCompensation is equal to aSlotTime". This defines its value.
       6. **Straw Poll**: Shall we reject the comment as indicated?
          1. Yes, No, Abstain
          2. Results: 11-2-3
       7. Mark Ready for Motion with the Rejected reason proposed.
    4. CID 8215 (GEN)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Not really in scope, and is a minor change
       3. Proposed resolution to reject due to scope.
       4. Discussion on if we should make the change or not.
       5. Proposed Resolution: Rejected. The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
       6. Discussion of we would make the proposed change as stated or not.
          1. There was concern on two of the location that could be debated if the change is appropriate.
          2. The change is technically out of scope, so we need to determine if we should reject or make change
       7. **Straw Poll:** Should we reject the comment as indicated?
          1. Yes, No, Abstain
          2. Results: 7-3-1
          3. Proceed with reject reason
       8. Mark Ready for Motion
    5. CID 8192 (GEN)
       1. Review comment
       2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2016-07-15 15:20:30Z) Change "two HT stations" to "two HT or directional multi-gigabit (DMG) stations" in the cited text.

In reply to the commenter, it is not necessary to expand HT, as this has already been done at line 16

* + - 1. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. Review Doc 11-16/842r0 Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0842-00-000m-revised-resolution-cid-8057.docx>
     2. CID 8057 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. Review discussion
        3. Proposed Resolution: **REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-15 15:27:06Z)**

At 1585.24 after "or lifetime limit." insert the following new sentence:

“If the AP does not receive a Block Ack frame in response to an A-MPDU that contains one or more individually addressed Data frames that are sent with the EOSP subfield equal to 1, and that require acknowledgment, it shall retransmit at least one of those frames at least once within the same SP, subject to applicable retry or lifetime limits."

AND

At 1584.20 Replace

“If the AP does not receive an acknowledgment to an individually addressed Data frame that requires acknowledgment and that is a non-A-MPDU frame containing all or part of an MSDU or A-MSDU sent with the EOSP subfield equal to 1, it shall retransmit that frame at least once within the same SP, subject to applicable retry or lifetime limit.”

With

"If the AP does not receive an acknowledgment in response to a non-A-MPDU frame that is an individually addressed Data frame that is sent with the EOSP subfield equal to 1, and that requires acknowledgment, it shall retransmit that frame at least once within the same SP, subject to applicable retry or lifetime limits."

* + - 1. No Objection - Mark Ready for Motion – again was in MAC-BZ, but was pulled from the planned motion
  1. Review doc: 11-16/831r2 Graham SMITH (SR Technologies)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0831-02-000m-resolutions-for-cids-8055-and-8170.docx>
     2. CID 8055 (MAC)
        1. Review comment
        2. This is on the same section as CID 8057 which is why that was done first.
        3. Discussion on the validity of doing any change and the timing of the history of the section.
        4. Concern for deleting “that requires acknowledgement”
        5. Discussion on possible options:
        6. Possible Resolutions:

*OPTION A*

REVISED (This resolution is essentially as proposed by the comment)

P1585.11 Insert at end of h), new paragraph

“The AP should not set the EOSP field to 1 in a frame that is not an individually addressed Data frame that requires acknowledgment”.

OR

*OPTION B*

REVISED; At 1585.21 and 1585.27 Delete “that requires acknowledgement”

AND

P1585.11 Insert at end of h), new paragraph

“The AP shall not set the EOSP field to 1 in a frame that is not an individually addressed Data frame that requires acknowledgment”.

* + - 1. Another option was to not make a change at all. Indicating that the proposed change is not large enough to make the change.
      2. Request to find objection for option A?
         1. No objection to option A
      3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2016-07-15 15:40:15Z): P1585.11 Insert at end of h), new paragraph
      4. "The AP should not set the EOSP field to 1 in a frame that is not an individually addressed Data frame that requires acknowledgment".
      5. No objection Mark Ready for Motion Option A
  1. **GEN AdHoc Comments** (2.10.x Notes from Mark Hamilton)
     1. Comments from 11-16/665r37, on Review tab: Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
     2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-37-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>
     3. CID 8278 (GEN):
        1. Most of the instances are used consistently. The other 4 seem to correctly qualify the object described.
        2. Suggest REJECTED, for out of scope.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-15 15:43:11Z) - The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.
        4. No objection. Ready for motion.
     4. CID 8200 (GEN):
        1. Reviewed proposed resolution.
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-15 15:44:37Z)
        3. No objection. Ready for motion.
     5. CID 8095 (GEN):
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: “The comment is out of scope.
        3. Reviewed instances of “at the antenna” and “at the antenna connector” and the only prior change was something different.
        4. Disagree - this was the subject of previous comments CID 6032, CID 7702, etc. Which are unsatisfied.
        5. No objection to rejecting, but A different rejection reason will be needed. Changing or deleting ‘connector’ in all instances is likely to result in an unintended change in meaning.
        6. ACTION ITEM #6: Jon to prepare a different resolution for next week.
     6. CID 8135 (GEN):
        1. This is on text that was changed in D5.0.
        2. Proposed Resolution: ACCEPTED (GEN: 2016-07-15 15:54:05Z).
        3. No objection. Ready for motion.
     7. CID 8153 (GEN):
        1. Review comment
        2. This is on text that was changed in D6.0.
        3. The proposed change here would remove the paragraph edited last time.
        4. This was added for a reason – there is some parameter in the RXVECTOR that is not available at the RXSTART.ind.
           1. Perhaps that parameter is no longer present.
        5. ACTION ITEM #7: Jon will try to find the prior change reason, and what parameter this is.
     8. CID 8003 (GEN):
        1. Review Comment
        2. The cited locations are referencing the value, not the field.
        3. Also, this is not on changed text.
        4. P1948 location is on TKIP, which we are no longer maintaining.
        5. In the P2949 location, we agree this is referring to the value, not a field.
        6. Propose Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2016-07-15 16:01:55Z) the cited locations are referring to the value in the field which is an OUI.–
        7. ACTION ITEM #8: Jon will work on crafting the resolution reason, off-line, with Adrian.
  2. **Review Doc 11-16/841r0**- Thomas HANDTE (Sony)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0841-00-000m-cid-8022-8024-resolution-text.docx>
     2. CID 8022 (Editor)
        1. Review comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: in Table 20-20 – LDPC Code Rates add a row “7/8 624 546”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 7/8 | 624 | 546 |

* + - 1. No objection Mark Ready for motion
    1. CID 8023/8024 (GEN)
       1. Review comment
       2. Propose to withdraw, but as they are on the tab today already -- no change.
       3. Already on Insufficient Detail for today’s motions
       4. Already marked ready for motion and included in a proposed motion
  1. **Review Doc 11-16/840r0** Thomas HANDTE (Sony)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0840-00-000m-cid-8020-8025-8026-resolution.docx>
     2. CID 8020 (GEN) and 8025 (GEN) and 8026 (GEN)
        1. Review comments
        2. Review discussion
        3. Review the performance improvements from the change.
        4. Concern that this is being presented here, and would be better to present in 802.11ay first. This is a potential for a lot of comments.
        5. These are small changes but understand the concern
        6. TGay may be a good place to discuss further.
        7. These three CIDs are on the Insufficient Detail motion for today.
        8. No Objection to just reject with today’s motion.
        9. Already marked ready for motion and included in a proposed motion
  2. **Review doc 11-16/822** – Hassan YAGHOOBI (Intel Corporation)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0822-00-000m-extension-of-mmwave-operating-class.docx>
     2. No CID
     3. FCC added new rules on 14 July 2016 (Yesterday), this is to address this new spectrum.
     4. Minimum 3 changes being proposed
     5. Proposed Changes:

1. Change p3379.13; Table D-1 - Regulatory requirement list: United States row Documents "...Sections 15.205, 15.209, and 15.247 and Subpart E,..." to "...Sections 15.205, 15.209, 15.247 and 15.255; and Subpart E,... "
2. Change p3389.25; Table E-1— Operating classes in the United States  Operating Class row 34 Channel Set value from "1,2,3 " to "1,2,3,4,5,6"
3. Change p3398.28; Table E-4— Operating Classes Operating Class row 180 Channel Set value from "1,2,3,4" to "1,2,3,4,5,6"
   * 1. The reference of FCC 15.255 was missing before, so that addition is actually an error correction, and because the FCC put the new band in that same document, it also covers the new channels.
     2. For the US Channels we add 3 channels “4, 5, 6” and for Global Channels (180) we add only “5, 6” as 4 was already there.
     3. Discussion on the consistency checks requirement
     4. Discussion on why the change to the Global band is being made now for the FCC change.
        1. Any region that does not have an active regulatory body, they can use this as an option.
        2. Many Regional Regulatory may or may not take the global change.
     5. Will consider a motion next week.
   1. **Motions: - 11-16/833r3** – Dorothy STANLEY (HPE)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/16/11-16-0833-03-000m-tgmc-brc-july-2016-teleconference-agenda-document.docx>
      2. **Motion #264: MAC, GEN CIDs agreed on July 8th teleconference**

Approve the comment resolutions on the following tabs and incorporate the indicated text changes into the TGmc draft:

* “Motion-MAC-BZ” tab in 11-15/565r48 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0565-48-000m-revmc-sb-mac-comments.xls>> except for CID 8057
* “”GEN-July8” tab in 11-15/665r37 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0665-37-000m-revmc-sb-gen-adhoc-comments.xlsx>>
  + - 1. Moved: Jon ROSDAHL Seconded: Adrian STEPHENS
      2. Discussion: None
      3. Noted that Hassan YAGHOOBI (Intel) and Dick ROY (SRA) are not voters
      4. Result: 11-0-1 **Motion Passes**
    1. **Motion #265 (Insufficient detail Tab):**

Resolve the CIDs in the

**-“**Insufficient Detail” tab in 11-15/532r52 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-52-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>> as “Rejected”, with a resolution of “The comment fails to identify changes in sufficient detail so that the specific wording of the changes that will satisfy the commenter can be determined.” Except for CIDs 8067, 8075, 8080, 8087, 8088, 8145, 8157, 8158, 8172, 8179, 8190, 8196, 8203, 8205, 8261, 8260, 8265, 8271, 8282, 8285, 8297, 8314, 8316, 8320, 8022

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS Seconded: Jon ROSDAHL
      2. Discussion: none
      3. Result: Approved by Unanimous Consent – **Motion Passes**
    1. **Motion 266 (Out of scope Tab):**

Resolve the CIDs in the

-“Out of Scope” tab in 11-15/532r52 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-52-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>> as “Rejected” with a resolution of “The comment is out of scope: i.e., it is not on changed text, text affected by changed text or text that is the target of an existing valid unsatisfied comment.” except for CIDs 8170, 8318, 8035, 8036, 8037, 8040, 8142, 8108, 8122, 8283, 8279, 8294, 8315

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS Seconded: Mark HAMILTON
      2. Discussion: None
      3. Result: Approved by Unanimous Consent – **Motion Passes**
    1. **Motion 267 (Editorials):**

Approve the comment resolutions in the

-“Editorials” tab in 11-15/532r52 <<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/15/11-15-0532-52-000m-revmc-sponsor-ballot-comments.xls>>. Except for 8294, 8292, 8030, 8252, 8218, 8230, 8224, 8212, 8211, 8307, 8116, 8197, 8195, 8126.

* + - 1. Moved: Adrian STEPHENS Seconded: Emily QI
      2. Discussion: None
      3. Result: Approved by Unanimous Consent – **Motion Passes**
  1. Next call is July 19th
     1. Review Draft agenda
     2. Proposed additions and time management were noted in 11-16/833r3
     3. Hassan’s Presentation 11-16/0822 motion will be made on Thursday.
     4. Motions for Tuesday was reviewed.
  2. Adjourned 13:04 ET (1:04pm)
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